

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Examiner is thanked for the Advisory Action dated October 26, 2006 and the courtesies extended during the telephone conference on November 15, 2006.

The status of the application is as follows:

- Claim 20 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.
- Claims 1-5, 7-12, 16 and 18-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Asai et al. (US 6,376,052).
- Claims 6 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Asai et al.

The rejections to the claims are discussed below.

### **35 U.S.C. §112 Rejection**

Claim 20 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. This rejection should be withdrawn because claim 20 has been amended herein as suggested by the Office in the subject Advisory Action.

### **35 U.S.C. §102(e) Rejection**

Claims 1-5, 7-12, 16 and 18-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Asai et al. (US 6,376,052).

As discussed with the Office in the telephone conference of November 15, 2006, **independent claim 1** recites, *inter alia*, removing a portion of conductive material to form a nub of the conductive material that can be electrically joined face-to-face with another structure through the nub of the conductive material, whereas Asia et al. disclose forming several intermediate layers over a filler 5 and a substrate, removing the layers over the substrate to form a protrusion of filler 5 covered with the intermediate layers, and then electrically connecting the filler 5 to another material via the intermediate layers (not face-to-face). Accordingly, Asia et al. do not anticipate claim 1, and, therefore, this rejection should be withdrawn.

**Independent claims 19 and 20** have been amended in accordance with allowable claim 1. In particular, claims 19 and 20 have been amended to recite that the bonding between the nubs of conductive material is face-to-face. Entry of these amendments and allowance of claims 19 and 20 are kindly requested

**Claims 2-5, 7-12, 16 and 18** depend from independent claim 1 and, by virtue of this dependency, are allowable for the reasons discussed above with respect to claim. Therefore, the rejection of these claims should be withdrawn.

**35 U.S.C. §103(a) Rejection**


Claims 6 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Asai et al. **Claims 6 and 15** depend from claim 1 and, by virtue of this dependency, are allowable for at least the reasons discussed above in connection with claim 1. Thus, the rejection of these claims should be withdrawn.

**Conclusion**

It is believed that each of the claims in the application is distinguishable one from the other and over the prior art. Therefore, reconsideration and allowance of the claims are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 7, 2006

By:   
Anthony M. Del Zoppo, III, Reg. No. 51,606  
CUSTOMER NO. 26681

AMD:cg